10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	Janice M. Michaels
	Nevada Bar No. 6062
2	jmichaels@wshblaw.com
	Nicholas F. Adams
3	Nevada Bar No. 14813
	nadams@wshblaw.com
4	Wood, Smith, Henning & Berman LLP
	2881 Business Park Court, Suite 200
5	Las Vegas, Nevada 89128-9020
	Telephone: 702 251 4100
6	Facsimile: 702 251 5405
7	Attorneys for Uber Technologies, Inc. and Rasier
	LLC erroneously sued as Uber Technologies, Inc
8	d/b/a Uber and Rasier, LLC
	diora obei ana Rusier, LLC
9	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA, SOUTHERN DIVISION

Plaintiff,	
v.	
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a foreign	

CARLOS ROBERTS.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a foreign corporation, dba UBER; RASIER LLC, a foreign limited liability company, dba UBER; JAMES RIVER INSURANCE COMPANY; DOE CLAIM ADJUSTER I through X; DOE CLAIM SUPERVISOR I through X; ROE INSURANCE COMPANY XI through XX; DOES I through X, inclusive; ROE CORPORATION XI through XX, inclusive and ROE COMPANIES I-X,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-CV-00635-VCF

STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR DEFENDANTS, UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. AND RASIER, LLC TO RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT

(FIRST REQUEST)

Trial Date: None Set

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. and RASIER, LLC (collectively "Defendants") and CARLOS ROBERTS (hereinafter "Plaintiff") (collectively, "the Parties") by and through their respective counsel, hereby stipulate and agree that Defendants shall have until May 25, 2022 to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint. This extension would be the first extension of time granted for Defendants to respond to the Complaint.

24354268.1:11009-0916

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

I. **Reasons For the Requested Extension**

Plaintiff filed his Complaint on March 26, 2022 in the Eighth Judicial District Court of Nevada. See ECF No. 1. Subsequently, Defendants were served on or about March 28, 2022. See Id. Defendants thereafter timely filed a petition for removal on April 18, 2022. See Id. After the petition for removal was filed, the time to respond to the Complaint was extended to April 25, 2022. See FRCP Rule 81(c)(2)(C).

The parties are currently evaluating a potential resolution to this matter and Defendants' involvement in this matter. The parties anticipate that they will be able to reach a determination as to whether Defendants should be dismissed from this matter within 30 days. As such, the parties are seeking an extension for Defendants to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint so that unnecessary fees and costs may be avoided.

Accordingly, the Parties stipulate and agree that Defendants, UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. and RASIER, LLC shall have until May 25, 2022 to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

By	/s/ Nicholas F. Adams
	JANICE M. MICHAELS
	Nevada Bar No. 6062
	NICHOLAS F. ADAMS
	Nevada Bar No. 14813
	WOOD SMITH HENNING & BERMAN
	2881 Business Park Court, Ste. 200
	Las Vegas, NV 89128-9020

Attorneys for Uber Technologies, Inc. and Rasier, LLC erroneously sued as Uber *Technologies, Inc. d/b/a Uber and Rasier,* LLC

/s/ Jacob G. Leavitt JACOB G. LEAVITT

Nevada Bar No. 12608 JASON C. BARRON Nevada Bar No. 7270 **BIGHORN LAW** 3675 W. Cheyenne Ave., Ste. 100 North Las Vegas, Nevada 89032

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UKDER

The Court having reviewed the foregoing STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR DEFENDANTS, UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. AND RASIER, LLC TO RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT (FIRST REQUEST) in the above-entitled matter and for good cause appearing therefor:

IT IS SO ORDERED that Defendants, UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. and RASIER, LLC shall have until May 25, 2022 to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint.

Dated: 4-28-2022

U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Contach